

1 Michael J. Niborski (State Bar No. 192111)
2 e-mail: mniborski@pryorcashman.com
3 PRYOR CASHMAN LLP
4 1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor
5 Los Angeles, California 90067-2302
6 Tel: (310) 556-9608
7 Fax: (310) 556-9670

5 Tom J. Ferber
6 e-mail: tferber@pryorcashman.com
7 Ross M. Bagley
8 e-mail: rbagley@pryorcashman.com
9 PRYOR CASHMAN LLP
10 7 Times Square
11 New York, New York 10036-6569
12 Tel: (212) 326-0188
13 Fax: (212) 798-6382

11 | *Attorneys for Defendant Daylight
Chemical Information Systems, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
3		
4	INTRODUCTION	1
5	A. The Parties	2
6		
7	B. The Complaint	3
8		
9	ARGUMENT	5
10		
11	STANDARDS	5
12		
13	I. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT 14 Satisfy THE RULE 8 STANDARD	6
15		
16	II. THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST DCIS ARE 17 IMPLAUSIBLE AND/OR FAIL TO STATE A CLAIM	9
18		
19	A. Plaintiff Premises Twelve Claims Upon A Single 20 Utterly Implausible Set Of Facts	9
21		
22	III. EVERY CLAIM AGAINST DCIS SUFFERS 23 FROM FATAL PLEADING DEFICIENCIES	10
24		
25	A. Plaintiffs' First Claim, Which Is Actually 26 Three Claims In Violation Of Rule 8, Is 27 Conclusory And Cannot Withstand Dismissal.....	10
28		
29	B. Plaintiffs Fail To State A Claim for Public 30 Disclosure of Private Facts Because No Public 31 Disclosure By DCIS Is Alleged.....	11
32		
33	C. Plaintiffs' Third Claim For False Light Does 34 Not Allege Any Falsehood, That DCIS Disclosed 35 Anything With Actual Malice, Or That Anything 36 Disclosed Was Highly Offensive	12
37		

1	D. Plaintiffs' Fifth Claim For Violation of the California Information Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.53, Must Be Dismissed.....	14
2		
3	E. Plaintiffs Fail To Allege A Violation Of The California Information Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.85, In Their Sixth Claim Because There Is No Allegation That DCIS Publicly Displayed Anything.....	15
4		
5	F. Plaintiff's Eighth Claim For Defamation Per Se, Slander and Libel Per Se, Does Not Identify Any False Statement Or Any Publication, Nor Does It Allege Malice.....	16
6		
7	G. Plaintiffs Ninth Claim, For Intentional Infliction Of Emotional Distress, Must Fail.....	17
8		
9	H. Plaintiffs' Fourteenth Claim For Non-Compliance With the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681b, Fails To Allege That DCIS Is A Consumer Reporting Agency Which Disclosed A Consumer Report.....	18
10		
11	I. Plaintiffs' Seventeenth Claim For Violation of the California Information Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798 et seq. Fails Because There Is No Allegation That Plaintiffs Are California Residents Or Customers Of DCIS	19
12		
13	J. Plaintiffs' Eighteenth Claim, For Violation of Cal Business and Professions Code § 17200, Is Inapplicable.....	20
14		
15	K. Plaintiff's Nineteenth Claim, For Negligent Infliction of Emotional and Mental Distress, Must Fail	21
16		
17	L. Plaintiffs Twentieth Claim, For Res Ipsa Loquitur, Is Not Legally Cognizable.....	22
18		
19	CONCLUSION.....	24
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE(s)</u>
4	<u>Arikat v. JP Morgan Chase & Co.,</u> 430 F. Supp. 2d 1013 (N.D. Cal. 2006)	18-19
6	<u>Ashcroft v. Iqbal,</u> 129 S. Ct. 1937, 173 L. Ed. 2d 868 (2009)	5, 16
8	<u>Bardin v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.,</u> 136 Cal. App. 4th 1255 (2006)	21
10	<u>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,</u> 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	5, 6, 11
12	<u>Berryman v. Merit Property Management, Inc.,</u> 152 Cal. App. 4th 1544 (2007)	21
14	<u>Branick v. Downey Sav. and Loan Association,</u> 39 Cal. 4th 235 (2006)	21
16	<u>Brooks v. Physicians Clinical Laboratory, Inc.,</u> No. CIV. S-99-2155 WBS DAD, 2000 WL 336546 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2000)	14
18	<u>Brown v. Allstate Insurance Co.,</u> 17 F. Supp. 2d 1134 (S.D. Cal. 1998)	21
20	<u>Cel-Tech Communications, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co.,</u> 20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999)	20
22	<u>Chaconas v. JP Morgan Chase Bank,</u> 713 F. Supp. 2d 1180 (S.D. Cal. 2010)	18
24	<u>Chambers v. Los Angeles Co.,</u> No. CV 09-3919 VBF (PLA), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 34812 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2010)	8

1	<u>Cochran v. Cochran,</u>	
2	65 Cal. App. 4th 488 (1998)	17, 18
3	<u>Conder v. Home Sav. of America,</u>	
4	680 F. Supp. 2d 1168 (C. D. Cal. 2010)	6
5	<u>Davis v. Regional Acceptance Corp.,</u>	
6	300 F. Supp. 2d 377 (E.D. Va. 2002).....	19
7	<u>Diaz v. Oakland Tribune, Inc.,</u>	
8	139 Cal. App. 3d 118 (1983).....	12
9	<u>Durrell v. Sharp Healthcare,</u>	
10	183 Cal. App. 4th 1350 (2010)	21
11	<u>Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc.,</u>	
12	74 Cal. App. 4th 1359	14
13	<u>Erlich v. Menezes,</u>	
14	21 Cal. 4th 543 (1999)	22
15	<u>Ess v. Eskaton Properties,</u>	
16	97 Cal. App. 4th 120 (2002)	21
17	<u>FDIC v. Hulsey,</u>	
18	22 F.3d 1472 (10th Cir. 1994).....	18
19	<u>Fellows v. National Enquirer, Inc.,</u>	
20	42 Cal. 3d 234 (1986).....	14
21	<u>Gicking v. Kimberlin,</u>	
22	170 Cal. App. 3d 73 (1985).....	22
23	<u>Gilbert v. Sykes,</u>	
24	147 Cal. App. 4th 13 (2007)	16
25	<u>Gill v. Curtis Publishing Co.,</u>	
26	38 Cal. 2d 273 (1952).....	12
27		
28		

1	<u>Gregory v. Albertson's, Inc.,</u> 104 Cal. App. 4th 845 (2002)	20
3	<u>Gu v. BMW of North America, LLC,</u> 132 Cal. App. 4th 195 (2005)	21, 22
5	<u>Hearns v. San Bernardino Police Department,</u> 530 F.3d 1124 (9th Cir. 2008).....	8
7	<u>Hill v. National Collegiate Athletic Association,</u> 7 Cal. 4th 1 (1994).....	11
9		
10	<u>Howard v. America Online, Inc.,</u> 208 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2000).....	10
11		
12	<u>Jackson v. Carey,</u> 353 F.3d 750 (9th Cir. 2003).....	6
13		
14	<u>Jacobson v. Schwarzenegger,</u> 357 F. Supp. 2d 1198 (C.D. Cal. 2004)	16
15		
16	<u>Jennifer M. v. Redwood Women's Health Ctr.,</u> 88 Cal. App. 4th 81 (2001).....	15
17		
18	<u>KOVR-TV, Inc. v. Superior Court,</u> 31 Cal. App. 4th 1023 (1995)	17
19		
20	<u>Kacludis v. GTE Sprint Communications Corp.,</u> 806 F. Supp. 866 (N.D. Cal. 1992)	5
21		
22	<u>Kassa v. BP West Coast Products, LLC,</u> No. C-08-02725 RMW, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61668 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2008).....	18
23		
24		
25	<u>Khoury v. Maly's of Cal., Inc.,</u> 14 Cal. App. 4th 612 (1993)	21
26		
27	<u>Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp.,</u> 29 Cal. 4th 1134 (2003)	21
28		

1	<u>Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court,</u> 51 Cal. 4th 310 (2011)	21
2		
3	<u>Maguca v. Aurora Loan Services,</u> No. SA CV 09-1086 JVS (ANx), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104251 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2009)	21
4		
5		
6	<u>Mason v. County of Orange,</u> 251 F.R.D. 562 (C.D. Cal. 2008)	7
7		
8	<u>McClatchy Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court,</u> 189 Cal. App. 3d 961 (1987).....	14
9		
10	<u>McHenry v. Renne,</u> 84 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 1996).....	8
11		
12	<u>Moreno v. Sayre,</u> 162 Cal. App. 3d 116 (1984).....	22
13		
14		
15	<u>Nelson v. Chase Manhattan Mortgage Corp.,</u> 282 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2002).....	19
16		
17	<u>North Star International v. Arizona Corp. Commission,</u> 720 F.2d 578 (9th Cir. 1983).....	5
18		
19	<u>Pacific Telegraph & Telegraph Co. v. City of Lodi,</u> 58 Cal. App. 2d 888 (1943).....	22
20		
21	<u>Parks Sch. of Business v. Symington,</u> 51 F.3d 1480 (9th Cir. 1995).....	5
22		
23	<u>Porten v. University of San Francisco,</u> 64 Cal. App. 3d 825 (1964).....	12
24		
25	<u>Potter v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.,</u> 6 Cal. 4th 965 (1993)	21
26		
27	<u>Reader's Digest Association v. Superior Court,</u> 37 Cal. 3d 244 (1984).....	13
28		

1	<u>Shulman v. Group W Products, Inc.,</u> 18 Cal. 4th 200 (1998)	11, 12
3	<u>Silicon Knights, Inc., v. Crystal Dynamics, Inc.,</u> 983 F. Supp. 1303 (N.D. Cal. 1997)	16-17
5	<u>Solano v. Playgirl, Inc.,</u> 292 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 2002).....	13
7	<u>Sollberger v. Wachovia Securities, LLC,</u> No. SACV 09-766 AG (ANx), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66233 (C.D. Cal. June 30, 2010).....	7, 8,12
10	<u>Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors,</u> 266 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2001).....	6, 9
12	<u>Starr v. Baca,</u> -- F.3d -- , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15283 (9th Cir. July 25, 2011)	10
14	<u>Telesaurus VPC, LLC v. Power,</u> 623 F.3d 998 (9th Cir. 2010) <u>cert. denied</u> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6889 (U.S. Oct. 3, 2011).....	6
17	<u>Western Mining Council v. Watt,</u> 643 F.2d 618 (9th Cir. 1981).....	5
19	<u>STATUTES</u>	
21	Cal. Civ. Code § 44-46	16
22	Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.3(b).....	14
24	Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.53	14, 19
25	Cal Civ. Code § 1798.80(c).....	20
27	Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.81	20
28	Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.82	21

1	Cal Civ. Code. § 1798.83	16, 20
2	Cal Civ. Code. § 1798.84(c).....	16
3	Cal Civ. Code. § 1798.85	15, 16, 19
4	Cal Civ. Code. § 1798.85(a)(1).....	15
5		
6	Cal. Evid. Code §646(b).....	22
7		
8	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.....	<i>passim</i>
9		
10	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).....	5
11		
12	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1)	5
13		
14	Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b).....	5, 21
15		
16	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)	<i>passim</i>
17		
18	Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).....	2
19		
20	15 U.S.C. § 1681.....	18
21		
22	15 U.S.C. §1681b.....	18
23		
24	15 U.S.C. §1681o.....	18
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF
2 RECORD:

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 19, 2011, at 10:00 a.m., or as
4 soon thereafter as this matter may be heard before the Honorable Andrew J.
5 Guilford of the above-entitled court located at 411 West Fourth Street, Santa Ana,
6 California 92701, Courtroom 10D, defendant Daylight Chemical Information
7 Systems, Inc., having good cause, will and hereby does move this Court for
8 dismissal of the Complaint filed by Plaintiffs Lisa Liberi et al., pursuant to Federal
9 Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 9, and 12(b)(6) on the following grounds:

10 (a) All causes of action fail to satisfy the pleading requirements required
11 by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8, and as set forth in Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949-
12 50, 173 L. Ed. 2d 868 (2009) and Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555
13 (2007);

14 (b) To the extent it is alleged, Plaintiffs' claims fail to state with
15 particularity circumstances constituting fraud in violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b);
16 and

17 (c) Failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted pursuant to
18 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

19 This Motion is and will be based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion,
20 the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the pleadings and papers on file
21 herein, all other matters of which the Court may take judicial notice and upon such
22 other or further material as may be presented at or before the hearing of this
23 matter.

24 This motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to Local
25 Rule 7-3 which took place on September 23, 2011.
26

1 **PRYOR CASHMAN LLP**
2
3

4 Dated: October 7, 2011 By: /s/ Michael J. Niborski
5 Michael J. Niborski
6 mniborski@pryorcashman.com
7 1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor
8 Los Angeles, CA 90067-2302
9 Tel: 310/556-9608 Fax: 310/556-9670

10 Tom J. Ferber
11 tferber@pryorcashman.com
12 Ross M. Bagley
13 rbagley@pryorcashman.com
14 PRYOR CASHMAN LLP
15 7 Times Square
16 New York, New York 10036-6569
17 Tel: 212/326-0188 Fax: 212/798-6382

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Daylight Chemical Information Systems (“DCIS”) respectfully submits this Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of its motion, pursuant to Rules 8, 9(b) and 12(b)(6), to dismiss all claims asserted against it in the First Amended Complaint (“FAC”).

This action springs from an “intra-Birther Movement” feud between Philip J. Berg (“Berg”) and Orly Taitz which has nothing to do with DCIS. Former defendant Yosef Taitz, the President and CEO of DCIS, was named as a defendant in the original complaint in this action and all claims against him were dismissed pursuant to a stipulation and order filed May 28, 2009 (the “2009 Order”). Dkt. 329-7. The 2009 Order specifically provided that Yosef Taitz could be re-joined as a defendant only upon a finding by the Court “that Plaintiffs have established evidence sufficient to support a cognizable claim” against him. Id. After this action was transferred to this Court, Plaintiffs filed the FAC in which, notwithstanding the utter implausibility of the allegations they were making, they sought to cast their net as widely as possible, in an effort to bring Yosef Taitz back into the case. They did so in violation of the 2009 Order because they did not and clearly could not offer the Court the evidence required to justify hauling Mr. Taitz back into a politically motivated skirmish that has nothing to do with him. Also caught in Plaintiffs’ inexcusable “wide net” approach to the inclusion of parties who have nothing to do with this skirmish are Reed Elsevier, Inc., Oracle Corporation, Intelius, Inc., and DCIS, the company with which Yosef Taitz is affiliated. Thus Plaintiffs, ignoring both the letter and the spirit of the 2009 Order, violated it not only by naming Yosef Taitz as a defendant in the FAC, but also by attempting to make an end run around that order by dragging in his company, DCIS, without any plausible or good faith basis.

1 The Court recently granted Yosef Taitz’s motion to dismiss to dismiss him
2 from the case because of Plaintiffs’ blatant violation of the 2009 Order. Dkt. 358.¹
3 The FAC – which repeatedly alleges that former defendant Yosef Taitz engaged in
4 certain acts “*through*” DCIS (see, e.g., FAC at ¶¶179-186) – tries to drag in DCIS
5 as a defendant as a “second bite at the apple” approach to asserting the now-
6 dismissed claims against Yosef Taitz. It is respectfully submitted that Plaintiffs’
7 transparent efforts to elude the proscription of the 2009 Order should be rejected
8 and that the claims against DCIS should also be dismissed.

9 **A. The Parties**

10 Plaintiff Lisa Liberi (“Liberi”), a paralegal at The Law Offices of Philip J.
11 Berg (“Berg Law Firm”), and Lisa Ostella (“Ostella”) plead 20 claims in all, 12 of
12 which lump DCIS in with numerous other defendants.² Berg joins Liberi and
13 Ostella in five of the claims,³ and the Berg Law Firm and Go Excel Global (“Go
14 Excel”) join Liberi, Ostella and Berg for three of the claims.⁴

15 DCIS is a privately held company with corporate offices in Laguna Niguel,
16 California. As noted above, former defendant Yosef Taitz is the president and
17 CEO of DCIS (FAC at ¶ 27). All claims concerning DCIS are based upon wildly
18 implausible allegations that former defendant Yosef Taitz used DCIS technology
19 to acquire Plaintiffs’ personal identifying information.

20
21
22

23 ¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), the involuntary dismissal for
24 failure to comply with the stipulation “operates as an adjudication on the merits.”
25 Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

26 ² Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 17, 18, 19 and 20.

27 ³ Claims 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9.

28 ⁴ Claims 3, 8 and 9.

1 **B. The Complaint**

2 The 170-page, 423-paragraph FAC alleges 20 claims against 19 defendants.
3 Most of the FAC's allegations are completely irrelevant to DCIS, but it is
4 nonetheless included in the majority of Plaintiffs' scattershot claims, among a
5 group of other unrelated defendants, including Reed Elsevier, Inc., Intelius, Inc.,
6 and Oracle Corporation.

7 The FAC alleges (1) that Plaintiffs' accurate private identifying information
8 was posted on the internet by defendant Orly Taitz and (2) that Orly Taitz spread
9 lies about Plaintiffs through various media. (FAC ¶¶ 69, 156, 257, 285-287.)
10 Plaintiffs allege that Orly Taitz committed these acts in retaliation for Plaintiffs'
11 refusal to sponsor her admission to the bar of the United States Supreme Court in
12 her crusade to prove that Barack Obama was not born in the United States and is
13 therefore ineligible to be President. (FAC ¶ 33.) Plaintiffs allege two theories as
14 to how Orly Taitz obtained Plaintiffs' identifying information.

15 First, Plaintiffs allege Orly Taitz obtained Liberi and Ostella's private
16 identifying information through a private detective agency, the Sankey Firm, Inc.,
17 and the Sankey Firm's subscription to LexisNexis and Intelius. (FAC ¶¶ 31, 66-
18 69, 135, 220, 257) ("[Orly] Taitz hired Neil Sankey, the Sankey Firm, Todd
19 Sankey and Sankey Investigations, Inc. to conduct the illegal searches of Plaintiffs
20 Liberi and Ostella's private data"). Orly Taitz has admitted that this is how she
21 obtained Plaintiffs' private information. (See motion to dismiss of Law Offices of
22 Orly Taitz, Dkt. 376, at pp. 7:14-18, 9:6-10) ("Orly Taitz Admissions").

23 Plaintiffs also allege that the information came to Orly Taitz through her
24 husband, former defendant Yosef Taitz, via software incorporated in computer
25 manufacturer Oracle's servers, which allegedly are used by LexisNexis and
26 Intelius in their businesses. (FAC ¶¶ 176-183.) Plaintiffs baldly allege that
27 DCIS's technology, DayCart, enabled former defendant Yosef Taitz to access any
28 computer anywhere in the world on an Oracle server as a result of an alleged

1 “partnership” with Oracle and Reed Elsevier. (Plaintiffs alternatively allege that
2 Oracle, Intelius and Reed’s cooperation was both negligent and intentional.) (See
3 FAC ¶¶ 179, 181-182, 356-363, 408).¹

4 Plaintiffs allege that former defendant Yosef Taitz, “through” DCIS, then
5 shared this information with Orly Taitz, who published it widely. (FAC ¶¶ 181,
6 303.) There is no allegation that Yosef Taitz distributed this information to
7 anyone but Orly Taitz, or that the information was false. *Id.* There is no
8 explanation for how DCIS the company, as opposed to Yosef Taitz the individual
9 defendant, shared this information with former defendant Yosef Taitz’s wife Orly
10 Taitz. There is no explanation for why DCIS – a company that for the last 25
11 years has developed advanced, innovative software to handle **chemical**
12 information – would seek to access every computer database using Oracle
13 products or why one would develop a “backdoor” in DayCart when, by Plaintiffs’
14 own allegations, the information was available to the Sankey Firm (or anyone else
15 for that matter) through a mere subscription to the LexisNexis and Intelius
16 services. (FAC ¶¶ 66-70, 156.) Finally, and critically for many of Plaintiffs’
17 jumbled claims, there is no allegation whatsoever linking DCIS to the alleged lies
18 Orly Taitz purportedly spread on the internet and radio and elsewhere.

19

20

21 ¹ In their motion to dismiss, Reed Elsevier Inc., LexisNexis Risk Solutions Inc.,
22 and LexisNexis Risk Assets Inc. (collectively the “Reed Defendants”) also note
23 the outlandishness of Plaintiffs’ theory: “Plaintiffs also make the convoluted and
24 utterly implausible contention that defendant Yosef Taitz caused a software
25 company with which he is involved to build a secret ‘back door’ into every Oracle
26 database in the world, and that Yosef Taitz used this ‘back door’ to gather from
27 some Reed Defendant data about plaintiffs.” (Dkt. 381 P. 10:23-26.) Moreover,
28 as stated in Intelius’s motion to dismiss, Docket No. 380-1, “On April 12, 2009,
[Orly] Taitz purchased a public records ‘background check’ search on the name
‘Lisa Liberi’ through Intelius.” (Dkt. 380-1, Nelson Decl., ¶ 5 and Ex. 1 in
support of Intelius motion.)

ARGUMENT STANDARDS

3 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires that a complaint set forth a
4 short and plain statement sufficient to notify defendant of the facts alleged against
5 it and show that the pleader is entitled to relief. While detailed factual allegations
6 are not required, Rule 8 “demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-
7 unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1940,
8 1949, 173 L. Ed. 2d 868, 883 (U.S. 2009) (citing Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550
9 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). Pursuant to Rule 8(d)(1), “[e]ach allegation must be
10 simple, concise, and direct.” If the claim is fraud based, the pleading is subject to
11 a higher standard of particularity pursuant to Rule 9(b).

12 Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), a complaint should be dismissed when its
13 allegations are legally insufficient. North Star Int'l v. Arizona Corp. Comm'n, 720
14 F.2d 578, 581 (9th Cir. 1983). “A complaint may be dismissed as a matter of law
15 for two reasons: (1) lack of a cognizable legal theory or (2) insufficient facts under
16 a cognizable theory.” Kacludis v. GTE Sprint Communications Corp., 806 F.
17 Supp. 866, 870 (N.D. Cal. 1992) (citation omitted). While the court must view all
18 allegations of material fact in the light most favorable to the non-moving party,
19 Parks Sch. of Bus. v. Symington, 51 F.3d 1480, 1484 (9th Cir. 1995), a court need
20 not “assume the truth of legal conclusions merely because they are cast in the form
21 of factual allegations.” Western Mining Council v. Watt, 643 F.2d 618, 624 (9th
22 Cir. 1981).

23 Moreover, the Supreme Court has recently articulated that “a complaint
24 must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief
25 that is plausible on its face’” Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. at 1949, 173 L. Ed. 2d at 884
26 (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570). “A claim has facial plausibility when the
27 plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable
28 inference that the defendant is liable for the alleged misconduct.” Id. at 1949, 173

1 L. Ed. 2d at 884. A court should not accept “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements
2 of a cause of action’s elements, supported by mere conclusory statements,” *id.*, or
3 “allegations that are merely conclusory, unwarranted deductions of fact, or
4 unreasonable inferences.” *Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988
5 (9th Cir. 2001). The 12(b)(6) standard thus requires “more than a sheer possibility
6 that a defendant has acted unlawfully” *Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949, 173 L. Ed. 2d at
7 884, citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557, and a complaint should be dismissed where
8 the factual allegations do not raise the “right to relief above the speculative level.”
9 *Bell Atlantic*, 127 S. Ct. at 1965.

10 Finally, “[a] district court may deny a plaintiff leave to amend if it
11 determines that allegation of other facts consistent with the challenged pleading
12 could not possibly cure the deficiency ... or if the plaintiff had several
13 opportunities to amend its complaint and repeatedly failed to cure deficiencies.”
14 *Telesaurus VPC, LLC v. Power*, 623 F.3d 998, 1003 (9th Cir. 2010) *cert. denied*,
15 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6889 (U.S. Oct. 3, 2011) (internal citation & quotations
16 omitted); *see also Jackson v. Carey*, 353 F.3d 750, 758 (9th Cir. 2003); *Conder v.*
17 *Home Sav. of Am.*, 680 F. Supp. 2d 1168 (C. D. Cal. 2010) (Guilford, J.).

18 **POINT I**

19 **THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT SATISFY THE RULE 8 STANDARD**

20 The FAC is not short; to the contrary, it is a prolix in the extreme with its
21 172 pages with 423 paragraphs. It is not a plain statement; indeed much of it,
22 including in particular the allegations against DCIS, includes a random collection
23 of technical jargon which Plaintiffs do not even attempt to elucidate. It is
24 repetitive and attempts to lay blame upon a group of unrelated “Defendants” for
25 single acts. And, most critically, it is not sufficiently drafted to notify DCIS of the
26 facts alleged against it, to satisfy the Federal Rules, or to comport with the notice
27 requirement of due process.

28

1 As pointed out by the Reed Defendants in their motion to dismiss the FAC,
2 defendants are generally lumped together as a group in Plaintiffs' allegations.
3 (Dkt. 381, Memorandum of Points and Authorities at p. 5:8-21.) DCIS is not even
4 identified in Plaintiffs' second, third, fifth or sixth claims against it. This lack of
5 specific reference to DCIS, together with the fact that certain claims are alleged
6 against "each and every defendant ... separately," make it impossible to determine
7 which claims were actually intended to be alleged against DCIS. (FAC ¶¶ 240,
8 249.) The FAC's convoluted jumble of allegations thus does not satisfy Rule 8's
9 pleading standard. See Sollberger v. Wachovia Secs, LLC, No. SACV 09-766
10 AG (ANx), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66233, at *11 (C.D. Cal. June 30, 2010)
11 (Guilford, J.) (dismissing claims where defendants were grouped together through
12 use of the "omnibus term 'Defendants'" and complaint was product of a "shotgun
13 pleading" style which "overwhelm defendants with an unclear mass of allegations
14 and make it difficult or impossible for defendants to make informed responses to
15 the plaintiff's allegations") citing Mason v. County of Orange, 251 F.R.D. 562,
16 563-64 (C.D. Cal. 2008) ("experience teaches that, unless cases are pled clearly
17 and precisely, issues are not joined, discovery is not controlled, the trial court's
18 docket becomes unmanageable, the litigants suffer, and society loses confidence in
19 the court's ability to administer justice.").

20 In further derogation of Rule 8(d)(1)'s language, the FAC's allegations are
21 anything but "simple, concise, and direct." They are convoluted and rambling and
22 utterly fail to use anything resembling "plain statements." For example, Plaintiffs
23 make the opaque allegations that:

24 • DCIS makes "applications" which include "toolkits" which are "built
25 into the design of Oracle" and allow "for remote applicational
26 execution, cross site scripting, remote interface and injection attacks"
27 (FAC ¶ 178.)

28

- “As a result of the design of Oracle and Daylight CIS’ toolkit based architecture applications, Yosef Taitz through Daylight CIS has top user access to any computer, server; and/or database in which Oracle products are located.” (FAC ¶ 180.)
- “Defendant Yosef Taitz through his Corporation, Daylight CIS created Daylight Toolkits for dual purpose intent. The Daylight applications are part of Oracle’s design. Oracle is scripted, through the use of Daylight Applications to interface all information, including but not limited to all information stored on Oracle servers, all customer log-in details and other private data, back to Defendant Taitz’s and Daylight CIS’s remote servers.” (FAC ¶ 304.)

12 The FAC should be dismissed because these allegations are vague, opaque
13 and “so verbose, confused and redundant that its true substance, if any, is well
14 disguised.” See e.g., Hearns v. San Bernardino Police Dep’t, 530 F.3d 1124, 1131
15 (9th Cir. 2008) (citations & quotations omitted); See McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d
16 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 1996) (“[s]omething labeled a complaint but written more
17 as ... prolix in evidentiary detail, yet without simplicity, conciseness and clarity as
18 to whom plaintiffs are suing for what wrongs, fails to perform the essential
19 functions of a complaint” and “impose[s] unfair burdens on litigants and judges.”).
20 Rule 8 is an independent basis for dismissal of the claims against DCIS. Id. at
21 1179; Chambers v. Los Angeles Co., No. CV 09-3919 VBF (PLA), 2010 U.S.
22 Dist. LEXIS 34812, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2010); Sollberger, 2010 U.S. Dist.
23 LEXIS 66233, at *13.

1 **POINT II**

2 **THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST DCIS**

3 **ARE IMPLAUSIBLE AND/OR FAIL TO STATE A CLAIM**

4 **A. Plaintiffs Premise Twelve Claims**

5 **Upon A Single Utterly Implausible Set Of Facts**

6 The Court need not accept as true Plaintiffs' far-fetched theory – that former
7 defendant Yosef Taitz was able, through DCIS, to access all the information on
8 any computer using Oracle servers. This theory is based entirely upon conclusory
9 allegations, and seeks to have this Court make "unwarranted deductions of fact"
10 and "draw unreasonable inferences" from the FAC's mix of confusing and highly
11 technical gibberish or bald conclusory allegations. Sprewell, 266 F.3d at 988.

12 Plaintiffs allege no facts supporting their claim that DCIS software is
13 incorporated in Oracle's products, or that the Reed and Intelius, Inc., defendants
14 use those products. (FAC ¶¶ 171, 176-179.) There is no allegation describing
15 what DCIS technology does or why Oracle allegedly uses it. There is no
16 allegation which even remotely begins to explain how or why DCIS – an
17 established company that deals with chemical information – would develop a
18 technology that would allow it to secretly access computers across the world.
19 There is no allegation explaining why Orly Taitz would not simply obtain this
20 information from the Sankey Firm or, therefore, why former defendant Yosef Taitz
21 would need to conduct this absurd over-blown and patently implausible scheme
22 merely to obtain Plaintiffs' identifying information.¹ There is no allegation
23 regarding how former defendant Yosef Taitz supposedly gave information to Orly
24 Taitz, his wife, "*through Daylight CIS*," and not simply in his role as her husband.
25 (FAC ¶ 303.) Plaintiffs allege no conduct by any DCIS employee, director,
26 engineer or manager other than former defendant Yosef Taitz, who is handcuffed

27
28 ¹ See Orly Taitz Admissions.

1 to every DCIS allegation. The FAC's allegations simply do not lay out a plausible
2 factual predicate entitling them to the presumption of truth. See Starr v. Baca,
3 F.3d __, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15283, at *37 (9th Cir. July 25, 2011) ("[f]irst, to
4 be entitled to the presumption of truth, allegations in a complaint or counterclaim
5 may not simply recite the elements of a cause of action, but must contain sufficient
6 allegations of underlying facts to give fair notice and to enable the opposing party
7 to defend itself effectively. Second, the factual allegations that are taken as true
8 must plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief, such that it is not unfair to require
9 the opposing party to be subjected to the expense of discovery and continued
10 litigation.").

11 Independent of Plaintiffs' wildly implausible allegations, all of the 12
12 claims against DCIS also fail to allege factual averments supporting essential
13 elements.

14 **POINT III**

15 **EVERY CLAIM AGAINST DCIS**

16 **SUFFERS FROM FATAL PLEADING DEFICIENCIES**

17 **A. Plaintiffs' First Claim, Which Is Actually**
18 **Three Claims In Violation Of Rule 8, Is**
19 **Conclusory And Cannot Withstand Dismissal**

20 In the first claim for relief, plaintiffs Berg, Liberi and Ostella allege that
21 their private identifying information was published, but allege no specific conduct
22 by DCIS in the paragraphs set out for their claim for invasion of privacy (see FAC
23 ¶¶ 187-204). The first legal theory for invasion of privacy subsumed within the
24 first claim alleges that there was a violation of the *First* and *Fourteenth*
25 *Amendments*. This theory must fail because there is no allegation that DCIS is a
26 government actor, and only a government actor can violate these constitutional
27 rights of privacy. See Oracle Decision at p. 4 citing Howard v. America Online,
28 Inc., 208 F.3d 741, 754 (9th Cir. 2000).

The second legal theory Plaintiffs purport to include within their first claim for relief is a violation of the California Constitution's right to privacy. For this claim to withstand a motion to dismiss, Plaintiffs must show (1) a legally protected privacy interest; (2) a reasonable expectation of privacy under the circumstances; and (3) conduct by defendant constituting a serious invasion of privacy. Hill v. National Collegiate Athletic Assn., 7 Cal. 4th 1, 39-40 (1994).

7 Plaintiffs fail to adequately set forth specific facts to support their claim that
8 DCIS committed a serious invasion of their privacy. The conclusory allegation
9 that “The Reed Defendants and Defendant Intelius, Inc., Yosef Taitz, Daylight CIS
10 and Oracle [conducted] willful and malicious acts in violating every aspect of the
11 Plaintiffs’ right to privacy, Plaintiffs’ right to be left alone and the Defendants
12 invasion of Plaintiffs’ privacy,” FAC ¶ 198, which is merely a rote recitation of
13 this tort’s elements, is insufficient to state a claim (Twombly, 550 U.S. at 556 n.3),
14 and does not allege “an egregious breach of the social norms underlying the
15 privacy right.” Hill, 7 Cal. 4th at 37.

16 Finally, to the extent the Court reads these allegations to include a potential
17 claim under the common law theory of intrusion upon seclusion as stated in the
18 Oracle Decision, this claim fails for the same reasons as Plaintiffs' claim under the
19 California Constitution and because Plaintiffs have failed to allege that DCIS's
20 conduct, purportedly enabling former defendant Yosef Taitz to harvest
21 information, caused their injury or would be highly offensive to a reasonable
22 person. See Shulman v. Group W Prods., Inc., 18 Cal. 4th 200, 232 (1998)
23 (intrusion claim requires allegations of (1) intrusion into a private space,
24 conversation or matter, (2) in a manner highly offensive to a reasonable person).

B. Plaintiffs Fail To State A Claim for Public Disclosure of Private Facts Because No Public Disclosure By DCIS Is Alleged

27 In keeping with Plaintiffs' shotgun pleading style, Liberi, Ostella and Berg
28 allege that their private identifying information was published, but make no

1 reference to DCIS in the paragraphs set out for this claim. (FAC ¶¶ 206-214.) See
2 Sollberger, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66233, at *12, *13 (noting that one type of
3 shotgun pleading is “where the plaintiff recites a collection of general allegations
4 toward the beginning of the Complaint and then each count incorporates every
5 antecedent allegation by reference” and finding that “[t]his shotgun pleading style
6 deprives Defendants of knowing exactly what they are accused of doing wrong ...
7 and this defect alone warrants dismissal”) (internal citation and quotation omitted).

8 To plead a claim for public disclosure of private facts, Plaintiffs must allege
9 (1) public disclosure, (2) of a private fact (3) which would be offensive and
10 objectionable to a reasonable person and (4) which is not of legitimate public
11 concern. Shulman, 18 Cal. 4th at 232. This claim requires a public disclosure “in
12 the sense of communication to the public in general or to a large number of
13 persons, as distinguished from one individual or a few.” Porten v. University of
14 San Francisco, 64 Cal. App. 3d 825, 828 (1964).

15 This claim fails because no there is no allegation that DCIS disclosed any
16 private facts to anyone, Diaz v. Oakland Tribune, Inc., 139 Cal. App. 3d 118, 131
17 (1983), and there is no allegation that the information was highly offensive or has
18 gone “beyond the limits of decency” Gill v. Curtis Publ’g Co., 38 Cal. 2d 273,
19 280 (1952).

20 **C. Plaintiffs’ Third Claim For False Light Does Not Allege
21 Any Falsehood, That DCIS Disclosed Anything With Actual
22 Malice, Or That Anything Disclosed Was Highly Offensive**

23 All Plaintiffs join in this claim, which purports to be against all defendants,
24 but once again there is no specific reference to DCIS in the allegations under the
25 “Third Cause of Action.” (FAC ¶¶ 216-225.) Instead, all Plaintiffs stick to the
26 more plausible theory on this claim that their private information came to Orly
27 Taitz through the Sankey Firm. (FAC ¶¶ 216, 220.)

28

1 The Court has stated in the Oracle Decision that in order to make out a
2 claim for false light, Plaintiffs must allege that (1) defendant disclosed information
3 about them that was actually false or created a false impression; (2) one or more
4 persons found the information to state or imply something highly offensive that
5 would have a tendency to injure Plaintiffs' reputation; (3) DCIS acted with
6 constitutional malice by clear and convincing evidence; and (3) Plaintiffs were
7 damaged by the disclosure. See Oracle Decision at p. 6 citing Solano v. Playgirl,
8 Inc., 292 F.3d 1078, 1082 (9th Cir. 2002).

9 First, there is no allegation of falsehood. Plaintiffs merely allege that
10 "Defendants Yosef Taitz and Dalight CIS provided all of Plaintiffs' private
11 personal identifying information, financial data, family data, birth data, and other
12 information to his wife, who used the information to carry out her threats against
13 the Plaintiffs." (FAC ¶ 77.) Elsewhere in the FAC, Plaintiffs allege that they were
14 harmed by the dissemination of their accurate "Social Security numbers, dates of
15 birth, place of birth, mother's maiden names, Plaintiff's maiden names, credit
16 reports, driver's license information, financial data, sealed court case information,
17 photographs, primary identification information, financial data, husband's names,
18 Social Security numbers and dates of birth, children's names and identities, and
19 other private data outlined herein..." (FAC ¶ 251.) Moreover, all claims of
20 falsehood are confined to Orly Taitz and the Sankey Firm. (FAC. ¶ 216-220.)
21 Since Plaintiffs base this claim on the alleged dissemination of accurate
22 information, the *sine qua non* of a false light claim is absent.

23 Second, even if Reed and Intelius kept incorrect personal information for
24 Plaintiff, which (according to Plaintiffs' singular, frivolous theory) was somehow
25 accessed by former defendant Yosef Taitz using DCIS software, there is no claim
26 that DCIS knew or had a reckless disregard for the truth of the information
27 allegedly provided to Orly Taitz. See Reader's Digest Ass'n v. Superior Court, 37
28 Cal. 3d 244, 253, 265 (1984).

1 Third, there is no allegation that disclosure of this allegedly false
2 information would be highly offensive to a reasonable person, another requisite
3 element of a false light claim. Fellows v. National Enquirer, Inc., 42 Cal. 3d 234,
4 238 (1986) (“[i]n order to be actionable, the false light in which the plaintiff is
5 placed must be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”).

6 Fourth, this false light claim is duplicative of Plaintiffs’ defamation claim
7 and should be dismissed for that independent reason. McClatchy Newspapers,
8 Inc. v. Superior Court, 189 Cal. App. 3d 961, 965 (1987) (duplicative false light
9 claim should be dismissed); Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc., 74 Cal. App
10 4th 1359, 1385 fn.13 (1999) (false light claim coupled with defamation claim is
11 superfluous); Brooks v. Physicians Clinical Lab., Inc., No. CIV. S-99-2155 WBS
12 DAD, 2000 WL 336546 4 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2000). Finally, Go Excel and the
13 Berg Law Firm may not state this claim because it may only be brought by a
14 natural person.

15 D. **Plaintiffs’ Fifth Claim, For Violation of**
16 **the California Information Privacy Act,**
17 **Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.53, Must Be Dismissed**

18 Section 1798.53 of the California Civil Code allows a claim against anyone
19 “who intentionally discloses information, not otherwise public, which they know
20 or should reasonably know was obtained from personal information maintained by
21 a state agency or from ‘records’ within a ‘system of records’ ... maintained by a
22 federal government agency ...” Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.53. “Agency” is defined as
23 “every [California] state office, officer department, division, bureau, board
24 commission, or other state agency...” Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.3(b).

25 There is no allegation that DCIS disclosed anything. Indeed, although it is
26 once again lumped in with “all Defendants,” DCIS is not referenced in the
27 paragraphs set out for this claim. (FAC ¶ 243.) Accordingly, there is no
28 allegation that DCIS knew or should have known that any information allegedly

1 disclosed by anyone originated within a state or federal government agency, nor
2 does the FAC include an allegation that DCIS obtained any “records” from within
3 a “system of records” maintained by a government agency. See Jennifer M. v.
4 Redwood Women’s Health Ctr., 88 Cal. App. 4th 81, 89 (2001) (“[o]n its face, the
5 Information Practices Act is aimed at barring or limiting the dissemination of
6 confidential personal information – and preventing the misuse of such information
7 – by government agencies”). The FAC merely alleges that information was
8 obtained and disclosed by other defendants from Liberi’s credit reports, which are
9 not maintained by a government agency. There is no allegation at all about
10 Ostella’s identifying information. (FAC ¶ 242.)

11 **E. Plaintiffs Fail To Allege A Violation Of The**
12 **California Information Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code**
13 **§ 1798.85, In Their Sixth Claim Because There**
14 **Is No Allegation That DCIS Publicly Displayed Anything**

15 Pursuant to California Civil Code § 1798.85(a)(1), a person may not
16 “[p]ublicly post or publicly display in any manner an individual’s social security
17 number. ‘Publicly post’ or ‘publicly display’ means to intentionally communicate
18 or otherwise make available to the general public.”

19 Here, again, DCIS is not referenced in the paragraphs set forth for this claim
20 and therefore there is no allegation that DCIS disseminated any information to
21 anyone. (FAC ¶¶ 248-264.) Moreover, the FAC alleges that it was the Sankey
22 Firm, not DCIS, that provided information to Orly Taitz and published that
23 information. (See FAC ¶ 257) (“[a]ll the private and primary identification
24 information of Plaintiffs Liberi and Ostella, outlined hereinabove was
25 intentionally published and promoted by Orly Taitz, The Law Offices of Orly
26 Taitz, Orly Taitz, Inc., DOFF, Neil Sankey, the Sankey Firm through Todd Sankey
27 and Sankey Investigations, Inc. with malice, gross negligence and with reckless
28 disregard as to the damages it would cause Plaintiffs Liberti and Ostella...”). The

1 bare allegations that “[a]ll Defendants directly participated in the illegal access of
2 and distribution of Plaintiffs Liberi and Ostella’s private confidential
3 information,” (FAC ¶ 255), and that “Plaintiffs’ Liberi and Ostella assert this
4 claim against each and every Defendant named herein” (FAC ¶ 249), do not satisfy
5 Rule 12(b)(6)’s plausibility standard. Ashcroft, 129 S. Ct. at 1949, 173 L. Ed. 2d
6 at 883-84.

7 Finally, while Plaintiffs’ failure to satisfy Rule 8 makes it difficult to
8 discern, it appears that they attempt to assert liability pursuant to § 1798.84(c) for
9 an alleged violation of Cal Civ. Code § 1798.85. However, § 1798.84(c)’s fine
10 applies only to violations of § 1798.83, which Plaintiffs have not alleged here.

11 **F. Plaintiff’s Eighth Claim, For Defamation Per Se,
12 Slander and Libel Per Se, Does Not Identify Any False
13 Statement Or Any Publication, Nor Does It Allege Malice**

14 To state a claim for defamation, including slander and libel, a plaintiff must
15 establish (1) a false statement of fact; (2) that is published; (3) of or concerning
16 plaintiff; (4) causing injury to plaintiff’s reputation; and (5) malice or fault. Cal.
17 Civ. Code § 44-46; Gilbert v. Sykes, 147 Cal. App. 4th 13, 27 (2007).

18 First, the information that former defendant Yosef Taitz was alleged to have
19 obtained via DCIS technology is not alleged to be false. Plaintiffs do not even
20 allege that a false statement was disseminated, id., and surely do not identify any
21 such false statement with the particularity required to state this claim. See
22 Jacobson v. Schwarzenegger, 357 F. Supp. 2d 1198, 1216 (C.D. Cal. 2004)
23 (“[u]nder California law, although a plaintiff need not plead the allegedly
24 defamatory statement verbatim, the allegedly defamatory statement must be
25 specifically identified and the plaintiff must plead the substance of the statement.
26 Even under liberal federal pleading standards, ‘general allegations of the
27 defamatory statements’ which do not identify the substance of what was said are
28 insufficient”) (internal citations omitted); Silicon Knights, Inc., v. Crystal

1 Dynamics, Inc., 983 F. Supp. 1303, 1314 (N.D. Cal. 1997) (“The words
2 constituting a libel or slander must be specifically identified, if not plead
3 verbatim.”) (citation & quotations omitted).

4 This claim also fails because there is no allegation of publication by DCIS
5 and no allegation that such disclosure was made with fault or malice. Indeed,
6 DCIS appears again to have been improperly lumped into this claim, which is
7 based upon the alleged dissemination of false information by Orly Taitz and the
8 Sankey Firm. (FAC ¶ 286) (“The [false] posts and statements were made by Neil
9 Sankey by and through Sankey Investigations and the Sankey Firm owned by
10 Todd Sankey, Orly Taitz as an Attorney and Officer of the Court by and through
11 the Law Offices of Orly Taitz and as President of Orly Taitz, Inc. and DOFF, with
12 knowledge of the false and libelous nature of the statements contained therein and
13 with gross negligence and reckless disregard for the truth.”). DCIS engaged in no
14 acts relating to this claim, and is not alleged to have done so.

15 **G. Plaintiffs Ninth Claim, For Intentional
16 Infliction Of Emotional Distress, Must Fail**

17 To state a claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress, Plaintiffs
18 must show (1) extreme and outrageous conduct by the defendant with the intention
19 of causing, or reckless disregard for the probability of causing, emotional distress;
20 (2) the plaintiff suffered severe or extreme emotional distress; and (3) the
21 plaintiff’s injuries were actually and proximately caused by the defendant’s
22 outrageous conduct. Cochran v. Cochran, 65 Cal. App. 4th 488, 494 (1998).
23 Conduct is outrageous only if it “exceed[s] all bounds of that usually tolerated in a
24 civilized community.” KOVR-TV, Inc. v. Superior Court, 31 Cal. App. 4th 1023,
25 1028 (1995) (citations and quotations omitted). It can be considered outrageous
26 only if (1) the defendant abuses a relation or position which gives him power to
27 damage the plaintiff’s interest; (2) the defendant knows that the plaintiff is
28 susceptible to injuries through mental distress; or (3) the defendant acts

1 intentionally or unreasonably with the recognition that the acts are likely to result
2 in illness through mental distress. Chaconas v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, 713 F.
3 Supp. 2d 1180, 1187-88 (S.D. Cal. 2010).

4 There is no alleged conduct by DCIS which could possibly be construed as
5 extreme or outrageous. Nor is there any claim that DCIS had any relationship with
6 any of the Plaintiffs, knew they were susceptible to mental distress, or that knew
7 that allegedly communicating Plaintiffs' identifying private information was likely
8 to result in illness.

9 Even assuming *arguendo* that this outlandish claim were plausible, there is
10 no allegation of conduct by DCIS which could be considered extreme and
11 outrageous, and the far-fetched allegation that DCIS has inserted some technology
12 into Oracle servers which enabled it to access other computers is not pleaded as
13 the proximate cause of Plaintiffs' alleged injuries. Cochran, 65 Cal. App. 4th at
14 494.

15 Finally, this claim cannot be brought by Go Excel or the Berg Law Firm
16 because it can only be brought by a natural person. See also FDIC v. Hulsey, 22
17 F.3d 1472, 1489 (10th Cir. 1994); Kassa v. BP West Coast Prods., LLC, No. C-08-
18 02725 RMW, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61668 * 23 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2008).

19 **H. Plaintiffs' Fourteenth Claim, For Non-Compliance
20 With the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681b,
21 Fails To Allege That DCIS Is A Consumer Reporting
22 Agency Which Disclosed A Consumer Report**

23 The Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681,¹ regulates "consumer
24 reporting agencies" who furnish "consumer reports." Arikat v. JP Morgan Chase

25
26
27
28 ¹ Although this claim is confusingly pleaded in violation of Rule 8, 1681o does
not actually state an independent claim and merely provides a remedy for
violations of 15 U.S.C. § 1681b.

1 & Co., 430 F. Supp. 2d 1013, 1023-25 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Nelson v. Chase
2 Manhattan Mortgage Corp., 282 F.3d 1057, 1060 (9th Cir. 2002).

3 This claim fails because there is no allegation that DCIS was a “consumer
4 reporting agency” or obtained any “consumer report.” Davis v. Regional
5 Acceptance Corp., 300 F. Supp. 2d 377, 385 (E.D. Va. 2002) (claim dismissed
6 where no allegation that plaintiff was a consumer reporting agency). Curiously,
7 Plaintiffs allege negligence in this claim, asserting that “Defendants Yosef Taitz,
8 Daylight CIS and Oracle were negligent in illegally scripting the Daylight Toolkit
9 Applications to interface the information maintained on the databases and
10 computers in which Oracle servers were running to Defendants Yosef Taitz and
11 Daylight CIS. Defendants Yosef Taitz and Daylight CIS were extremely negligent
12 in sharing the private data they illegally obtained with his wife, to carry out his
13 wife’s threats against the Plaintiffs.” (FAC ¶358) (emphasis supplied). As the
14 reference to “his wife” makes clear, this is really a claim against Yosef Taitz, who
15 is no longer a defendant. In any event, there is no explanation of how DCIS could
16 develop technology unintentionally, or how DCIS intentionally or unintentionally
17 communicated anything to Orly Taitz.

18 **I. Plaintiffs’ Seventeenth Claim, For Violation of the**
19 **California Information Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code**
20 **§ 1798 *et seq.*, Fails Because There Is No Allegation That**
21 **Plaintiffs Are California Residents Or Customers Of DCIS**

22 In a particularly egregious violation of Rule 8, this claim does not identify
23 any specific legal theory, but merely cites to the whole Information Privacy Act
24 section of the California Civil Code. As an initial matter and as noted in the
25 Oracle Decision, because § 1798.53 and § 1798.85 have already been individually
26 alleged in the FAC in Plaintiffs’ Fifth and Sixth claim, DCIS does not repeat its
27 arguments to dismiss claims under those sections here.

28

1 Plaintiffs may mean to plead a claim under § 1798.81, which states that “[a]
2 business shall take all reasonable steps to destroy … customer’s records within its
3 custody or control containing personal information…,” and permits a California
4 resident who is a customer of a business to sue for disclosure of personal
5 information gathered in connection with a commercial transaction. Cal. Civ. Code
6 § 1798.81.

7 First, as noted in the Oracle Decision, Liberi is a resident of New Mexico
8 and Ostella is a resident of New Jersey, not California, and thus neither may bring
9 a claim under § 1798.81 or § 1798.82. (FAC ¶¶ 4, 8.) Second, Plaintiffs may not
10 plead a claim under § 1798.83 because that section applies only to customers and
11 there is no allegation that Liberi or Ostella were DCIS customers. See Cal Civ.
12 Code § 1798.80(c) (defining “Customer” as someone who previously provided
13 “personal information to a business for the purpose of purchasing or leasing a
14 product or obtaining a service from a business.”). Nor is there an allegation that
15 DCIS disclosed any information to any third party.

16 Finally, to the extent Plaintiffs may be attempting to plead a claim under
17 California Civil Code § 1798.82 requiring California businesses to disclose any
18 security breach of a computer system containing personal information to any
19 California resident, this claim must fail because there is no allegation that DCIS
20 ever owned, licensed or maintained computerized data containing Plaintiffs’
21 personal information or that there was ever a breach of DCIS’s security system.

22 **J. Plaintiffs’ Eighteenth Claim, For Violation of
23 Cal. Business and Professions Code § 17200, Is Inapplicable**

24 Section 17200 of the California Business and Professions Code prohibits
25 “any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.” Here, there was no
26 unfair or fraudulent practice alleged to have been committed by DCIS. See
27 Gregory v. Albertson’s, Inc., 104 Cal. App. 4th 845, 854 (2002) citing Cel-Tech
28 Comm’ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co., 20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999);

1 Berryman v. Merit Property Mgmt., Inc., 152 Cal. App. 4th 1544, 1555 (2007);
2 Durrell v. Sharp Healthcare, 183 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 1366 (2010). Because no
3 unfair or fraudulent practice has been alleged, this claim has no predicate and
4 should be dismissed. Maguca v. Aurora Loan Servs., No. SA CV 09-1086 JVS
5 (ANx), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104251 *10 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2009) (dismissing
6 §17200 claim predicated on other claims). This vague fraud-based claim also fails
7 Rule 9(b)'s particularity standard. Khoury v. Maly's of Cal., Inc., 14 Cal. App.
8 4th 612, 619 (1993); Bardin v. DaimlerChrysler Corp., 136 Cal. App. 4th 1255,
9 1271 (2006).

10 Finally, §17200 provides only for restitution as relief, Korea Supply Co. v.
11 Lockheed Martin Corp., 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1151 (2003), and private individuals
12 cannot seek damages for unfair business practices under § 17200. Brown v.
13 Allstate Ins. Co., 17 F. Supp. 2d 1134, 1140 (S.D. Cal. 1998). Here, there is no
14 allegation of economic injury as a result of fraud or unfair competition by DCIS.
15 Branick v. Downey Sav. and Loan Ass'n, 39 Cal. 4th 235, 240 (2006); see also
16 Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court, 51 Cal. 4th 310, 323-26 (2011).

17 **K. Plaintiff's Nineteenth Claim, For Negligent
18 Infliction of Emotional and Mental Distress, Must Fail**

19 Outside of the context of a plaintiff who witnessed an injury to a close
20 family member, see Gu v. BMW of North Am., LLC, 132 Cal. App. 4th 195, 204
21 (2005), there is no independent tort of negligent infliction of emotional distress.
22 Potter v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 6 Cal. 4th 965, 984 (1993). Thus, to make
23 out a claim of negligent infliction of emotional distress, Plaintiffs must plead the
24 traditional elements of negligence, including duty, breach, causation and damages.
25 See e.g., Ess v. Eskaton Props., 97 Cal. App. 4th 120, 126 (2002).

26 Plaintiffs have failed to allege that DCIS owes them any duty. Indeed,
27 “[t]here is no duty to avoid negligently causing emotional distress to another.”
28 Potter, 6 Cal. 4th at 984. Thus, “unless the defendant has assumed a duty to

1 plaintiff in which the emotional condition of the plaintiff is an object, recovery is
2 available only if the emotional distress arises out of the defendant's breach of
3 some other legal duty and the emotional distress is proximately caused by that
4 breach of duty." Id. at 985. A legal duty may be imposed by law, be assumed by
5 the defendant, or exist by virtue of a special relationship which is clearly related to
6 the plaintiff's mental or emotional well-being, Gu, 132 Cal. App. 4th at 207, or
7 personal relationships. Erlich v. Menezes, 21 Cal. 4th 543, 559 (1999). No such
8 relationship or independent duty is (or could be) alleged. In addition, there is no
9 coherent allegations of unintentional breach by DCIS.

10 **L. Plaintiffs Twentieth Claim, For *Res Ipsa*
Loquitur, Is Not Legally Cognizable**

11 This claim fails Rule 12(b)(6) because *res ipsa loquitur* is not a legally
12 cognizable claim. *Res ipsa loquitur* is a rule of evidence which allows the
13 plaintiff, in the absence or direct proof, to argue that an accident was of such a
14 nature that the injury was more probably than not the result of the defendant's
15 negligence. Gicking v. Kimberlin, 170 Cal. App. 3d 73, 75 (1985); Pacific Tel. &
16 Tel. Co. v. City of Lodi, 58 Cal. App. 2d 888, 895 (1943) ("*res ipsa loquitur* rule
17 is not a rule of substantive law imposing liability in the absence of negligence but
18 is a rule of evidence giving rise to an inference of negligence in certain cases");
19 Cal. Evid. Code § 646(b). To take advantage of this rule of evidence, Plaintiffs
20 must allege that (1) the accident was of a kind which ordinarily does not occur in
21 the absence of someone's negligence, (2) the accident was caused by an agency or
22 instrumentality within the exclusive control of the defendant, and (3) the accident
23 must not have been due to any voluntary action or contribution on the part of the
24 plaintiff. Moreno v. Sayre, 162 Cal. App. 3d 116, 123 (1984).

25 Taken as a claim for negligence, incorrectly pleaded in violation of Rule 8
26 and duplicative of their claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress, this
27 claim must fail along with Plaintiffs' nineteenth claim. In addition, there is no
28

1 allegation that any private information was within DCIS's exclusive control; to the
2 contrary, Plaintiffs specifically allege that it was within Reed and Intelius's
3 exclusive control.

CONCLUSION

5 For reasons known only to Plaintiffs, they have attempted to expand the
6 politically-based battles between themselves and Orly Taitz to a number of
7 entities, including DCIS, which have no role or interest in their differences. As
8 the Court noted in the Oracle Decision, Plaintiffs' prolix, scattershot FAC
9 "threatens to spiral out of control." Plaintiffs' transparent attempt to do indirectly
10 that which they cannot do directly – i.e., to assert baseless attacks against DCIS as
11 a substitute for former defendant Yosef Taitz – should be rejected. All of
12 Plaintiffs' claims against DCIS fail to meet the standards of Rules 8 and 12(b)(6).

13 Defendant DCIS therefore respectfully requests that the Court dismiss the
14 Complaint without leave to amend and with prejudice.

PRYOR CASHMAN LLP

/s/ Michael J. Niborski

Michael J. Niborski

1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90067-2302

mniborski@pryorcashman.com

Tom J. Ferber

7 Times Square

New York, New York 10036-6569

tferber@pryorcashman.com

Attorneys for Defendants

Daylight Chemical Information Systems, Inc.